



**COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES
FOR
ACCREDITATION OF
TEACHER EDUCATION**



COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Introduction

Recent action by the U.S. Secretary of Education has resulted in the existence of two federally-recognized accreditors for teacher education: the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). Both of these accreditors are also recognized by the Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).

Our organization, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), has a long history of significant participation in accreditation activities and plays a leading role in public and professional accountability policy for teacher preparation. One of AACTE's most important responsibilities is in providing timely information for our members and the education community. In this role, we are making available the attached document providing comparative information on the two accreditors.

AACTE's goal is to develop a single accreditation system that achieves important accountability principles and has as its ultimate purpose serving the needs of P-12 students taught by the professionals prepared in our colleges and universities. To advance this purpose, we will work with both NCATE and TEAC to build a stronger accreditation function for teacher education with leadership from all segments of the teaching profession. The AACTE statements appended to the comparison chart support that direction, and we invite all educators and members of the public to join us in this effort.

David G. Imig
President, AACTE

Ana Maria Schuhmann
Chair, AACTE Board of Directors

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

	NCATE	TEAC
Mission	The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is a non-profit, non-governmental organization that accredits colleges and universities that prepare teachers and other professional personnel for work in elementary and secondary schools. The NCATE accreditation process determines whether schools, colleges, and departments of education meet standards for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel. Through standards that focus on systematic assessment and performance-based learning, NCATE encourages accredited institutions to engage in continuous improvement based on accurate and consistent data.	The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) is a non-profit organization of institutions of higher education and other groups and individuals devoted to the improvement of academic degree programs for professional educators. The Council's primary work is to assure the public about the quality of the professional programs it accredits. It provides this assurance through a system of accreditation that verifies and evaluates the evidence institutions of higher education rely on for their claim that they prepare competent, carrying, and qualified professional educators.
Governance	NCATE is a coalition of more than 30 national associations representing the education profession at large. The associations that comprise NCATE appoint representatives to NCATE's boards, which develop NCATE standards, policies, and procedures. Membership on policy boards includes representatives from organizations of teacher educators, teachers, state and local policymakers, and professional specialists.	TEAC is comprised of member institutions. Members with candidate, initial, provisional, pre-accreditation, or continuing accreditation status have a single vote. TEAC is governed by a self-perpetuating Board of Directors that includes teacher educators, administrators, teachers, public members, and others broadly representative of the field of education. Affiliate members of TEAC have no voting rights. (Affiliates are institutions that do not wish to undertake candidate membership status. Individuals, professional associations, and agencies may also be affiliate members.)
Entity Accredited	Accredits professional education units, with programs reviewed by professional specialty associations and/or approved by states Definition of unit is the institution, college, school, department, or other administrative	Accredits programs . Definition of program is a planned sequence of academic courses and experiences leading to a degree, and/or a state license (or a certificate), or some other credential, that entitles the holder to

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Entity Accredited, <i>continued</i>	body with the responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and continuing preparation of teachers and other school personnel.	perform professional education services in schools. Examples are programs that prepare secondary and elementary teachers, special educators, school counselors, and administrators.
Guiding Philosophy	<p>The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for the unit and the bases of the unit's intellectual philosophy. The conceptual framework provides the following structural elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The mission of the institution and unit 2. The unit's philosophy, purposes, professional commitments and dispositions 3. Knowledge bases 4. Performance expectations for candidates 5. The system by which candidate performance is assessed <p>Evidence of the Conceptual Framework throughout the standards includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shared vision and purpose of the unit 2. Coherence of program elements 3. Professional commitments and dispositions 4. Commitment to diversity 5. Commitment to technology 6. Candidate proficiencies aligned with professional and state standards 	<p>TEAC requires that a program seeking accreditation provide a rationale for the assessments it employs to support its claims that the program's graduates are competent, caring, and qualified and that the program meets TEAC's three quality principles and capacity standards.</p> <p>The rationale for the assessments links the assessments to the program's goal, the claims the program makes about candidate learning and accomplishment, and the program's requirements. The rationale is evaluated for completeness, coherence, and its roots in scholarship.</p> <p>The program must also describe the train of reasoning behind the program—the theories, scholars, arguments, experiences, traditions, etc., that the faculty members rely on to support their beliefs about the program.</p>
Basis of Evaluation	<p>Unit Standards for meeting a specified level of performance. Six performance-based standards focus on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Content knowledge b. Pedagogical content knowledge c. Professional knowledge and skills d. Dispositions e. P-12 student learning 2. Assessment system and unit evaluation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Assessment system implementation b. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation on program quality, unit operations, and candidate performance c. Use of data for program 	<p>Program's Evidence for Quality Principles. The principles focus on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence of (candidate) learning <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Subject matter knowledge b. Pedagogical knowledge c. Teaching skill and caring with special attention to learning how to learn, multi-cultural perspectives and accuracy, and technology 2. Evidence that the assessment of (candidate) learning is valid <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Rationale for the links among candidate learning assessments and the program's goals, claims, and requirements b. Evidence of valid assessment 3. Evidence of the program's continuous improvement and

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

<p>Basis of Evaluation, <i>continued</i></p>	<p>improvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Field experiences and clinical practice <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Collaboration between unit and P-12 school partners b. Design, implementation and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice c. Candidates' development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all P-12 students learn 4. Diversity <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Design, implement, and evaluate curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all P-12 students learn b. Experiences working with diverse faculty on campus and in schools c. Experiences working with diverse candidates in professional education courses and in schools d. Extensive and substantive field experiences and clinical practices working with diverse students in P-12 schools 5. Faculty qualifications, performance, and development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Qualified faculty with earned doctorates or exceptional expertise; contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels they supervise b. Model best professional practices in teaching; reflective of conceptual framework, incorporate appropriate performance assessments c. Model best professional practices in scholarship d. model best professional practices in service e. Collaborate in community of learners f. Unit evaluates professional education faculty performance g. Unit facilitates professional development, mentoring new faculty, supports scholarly work 6. Unit governance and resources 	<p>quality control</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Program decisions and planning based on evidence of candidate learning b. Influential quality control system <p>Standards of Capacity for Program Quality</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Curriculum <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reflects an appropriate number of credits and credit hour requirements for the components of Quality Principle I b. Meets the state's program or curriculum course requirements for granting a professional license c. Does not deviate from, and has parity with, the institution's overall standards and requirements for granting the academic degree 2. Faculty <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Accept the Inquiry Brief and that the preparation of competent, caring and qualified educators is their own goal for the program b. Accept the Inquiry Brief as demonstration of the faculty's accurate and balanced understanding of the disciplines that are connected to the program c. Are qualified to teach the courses in the program to which they are assigned d. Qualifications are equal to or better than the statistics for the institution as a whole with regard to the attributes of the members of the faculty 3. Facilities, equipment, and supplies <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Appropriate and adequate budgetary and other resource allocations b. Proportionate to the overall institutional resources; students, faculty, and staff must have equal and sufficient access to facilities, equipment, and supplies c. Adequate quality control system 4. Fiscal and administrative capacity
--	--	--

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

<p>Basis of Evaluation, <i>continued</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Unit leadership and authority for recruiting and admission practices, academic calendars and publications; candidate access to student services; collaboration with P-12 practitioners; faculty professional development b. Unit budget at least proportional to other units on campus; adequately supports programs c. Personnel policies and practices encourage faculty engagement in wide range of professional activities, work in schools, and service d. Unit facilities are outstanding to support candidates in meeting standards e. Unit resources include technology to support high-quality and exemplary programs <p>Standards are assessed by use of written, shared criteria (rubrics) for judging performance. The rubrics indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated. Levels are "unacceptable," "acceptable," and "target."</p> <p>To be accredited, every standard must be met.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sound financial condition b. Program resources are proportionate to overall allocations to other programs and are sufficient to support operations c. Sufficient quality monitoring and control of financial and administrative resources d. Appropriate level of institutional investment in and commitment to faculty development; faculty workload commensurate with other programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Student support services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sufficient to support successful completion of program b. Equal to the level of support provided by institution as a whole c. Monitored to ensure services contribute to student success 6. Recruiting and admissions practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Encourage recruitment and retention of diverse students; responsive to need for individuals to serve in high demand areas and locations b. Academic calendar distributed to students c. Claims in published materials must be supported with evidence d. Fair and equitable published grading policy 7. Student complaints <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Kept on file and provided to TEAC b. Must be proportionally no greater or significant than those of other programs
<p>Nature of Standards for Content and Performance</p>	<p>Determined by national subject-matter associations and/or state program approval processes</p>	<p>Determined by the program with the constraint that it meet TEAC's standards and principles and that it is consistent with claims publicly made elsewhere, including claims made to the state licensing authority.</p>
<p>Methods of Assessing Teacher Candidate Learning</p>	<p>State licensing test scores—80 percent pass rate requirement for units (necessary but not sufficient) Additional sources of evidence:</p>	<p>Some combination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. student grades and grade point averages 2. Portfolios of representative

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Methods of Assessing Teacher Candidate Learning, <i>continued</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summaries of assessments of candidates, including those at entry, at critical points in candidate development, and prior to program completion currently being used; based on rubrics or criteria for determining levels of candidate accomplishment 2. Candidate proficiencies expected upon completion of programs and candidate work samples 3. Follow-up studies of graduates 4. Data on performance of graduates 5. Evaluations during induction or mentoring year 6. Records of current performance assessments of candidate progress and summary results 7. Program review documents from NCATE -affiliated specialty organizations 8. External assessment data (e.g., state licensing exams, employer reports, state program reviews) 9. Assessment of appropriate professional dispositions by candidates 10. Interviews with dean or chair of professional education unit, director of clinical/laboratory experiences, unit and arts and sciences faculty, counselors and advisors to education candidates, candidates at initial and advanced levels, graduates, principals and cooperating teachers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. academic accomplishments 4. Student scores on standardized license examinations 5. Student scores on admission tests for graduate study 6. Job placement rates 7. Career retention rates 8. Program and course completion rates 9. Evaluations by employers 10. Evaluations by trained raters 11. Evaluations of performance of program graduates by their own students 12. Alumni follow-up studies 13. Professional recognition rates of graduates 14. Rates of professional advanced study 15. Rates of professional advancement of program graduates 16. Rates of professional activities 17. Academic achievements of the program graduates own students 18. Case studies of candidates' learning and accomplishment 19. Student work samples from practice teachers' teaching
Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation	<p>Fundamental requirements that must be met before a unit is permitted to advance to candidacy for initial accreditation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The institution recognizes and identifies a professional education unit that has responsibilities and authority for the preparation of teachers and other professional education personnel 2. A dean, director, or chair is officially designated as head of the unit and is assigned the authority and responsibility for its overall administration and operation 3. Written policies and procedures guide the operations of the unit 4. The unit has a well-developed conceptual framework that 	<p>Precondition evidence that is used to determine eligibility:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence that there is a faculty that is responsible and held accountable for the program 2. Evidence that the program has graduates who satisfy licensure or other requirements for teaching in public or private P-12 schools 3. Evidence that the program is state approved 4. An attestation by the head of the program of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A commitment to the TEAC goal and quality principles b. An understanding of the fact that TEAC may disclose the program's accreditation status c. A commitment to provide all

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

<p>Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation, <i>continued</i></p>	<p>establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educator to work in P-12 schools and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The unit regularly monitors and evaluates its operations, the quality of its offerings, performance of candidates, and effectiveness of its graduates 6. The unit has published criteria for admission to and exit from all initial teacher preparation and advanced programs, and can provide summary reports of candidate performance at exit, based upon its stated exit criteria 7. In states with a program approval process, the unit's programs are approved by the appropriate state agency or agencies 8. If the institution is located in a non-partner state or in a partner state that requires the submission of program reports for national review through NCATE, the unit has submitted program reports for each program for which NCATE has approved program standards 9. The institution is accredited, without probation or an equivalent status, by the appropriate institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education 10. Unit and each program must meet 80% pass rate on required state content area tests 	<p>necessary information for the accreditation process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Evidence that the program is offered by a regionally accredited college, school, or university 6. Evidence that the program meets the college or university's standards for an academic degree 7. Additional examples of evidence of institutional commitment to the program (submitted with accreditation documentation) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Appropriate and adequate budgetary and other resource allocations to the professional education program b. A fully qualified faculty (within and outside the professional education faculty group of the institution) who teach the required courses in the program c. Admissions and mentoring policies that encourage the recruitment and retention of diverse students with demonstrated potential as professional educators and that also respond to the nation's need for qualified individuals to serve in high demand subject areas and locations d. Partnership agreements and contracts that include sharing of resources with elementary and secondary schools and other public or private agencies that participate in the program's clinical components e. An appropriate priority for the professional education programs within the institution and a statement of the criteria for program priorities at the institution f. An investment in faculty development, research and scholarship, and national and regional service g. An investment in student support services (e.g. counseling, career placement, advisement, media and technology support 8. Regional accreditation
---	---	---

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Institution's First Steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institution files "Intent to Seek NCATE Accreditation" form (annual fee begins) 2. Unit completes "Preconditions Report" 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institution contacts TEAC for consultation regarding accreditation process 2. Institution files "Eligibility Application" (annual fee begins)
Format for Institutional Evidence	Institutional Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overview of the institution 2. Conceptual framework 3. Evidence for meeting each standard <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions b. Program assessment and unit capacity c. Field experiences and clinical practice d. Diversity e. Faculty qualifications, performance, and development f. Unit governance and resources 	Inquiry Brief <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction to the program 2. Claims and rationale 3. Methods of assessing student learning 4. Results 5. Discussion and plan for continuous improvement 6. References 7. Appendices (internal audit of the quality control system, standards of capacity for program quality, profile of characteristics of quality of program faculty, program requirements)
Review Process	Board of Examiners (3 member minimum): During 5-day period, BOE team conducts on-site visit. They examine and assess the data generated by the unit's assessment system and the quality of that system. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interviews—conducted with faculty/administrators of professional education unit and supporting units to validate information in the institutional report 2. Open interviews—conducted with candidates, faculty and others 3. Report—written on site, addressing the unit's compliance with standards. The report also cites areas for improvement in evidence for the standards 	Auditors (2 member minimum): During 2-3 day period, audit team conducts on-site visit. They determine the trustworthiness of the Inquiry Brief through probes into the accuracy and precision of the evidence cited in support of the program's claims. The audit consists of the reanalysis of primary source data, fact checking, and probes for consistency, corroboration, disconfirmation, accuracy, and <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interviews—conducted with administrators/faculty/students to ascertain that the characterizations of evidence are accurate 2. Audit Report—written off site, vouching for the accuracy of the evidence found in the Inquiry Brief, shared with program and corrected for accuracy. The auditors determine whether the Inquiry Brief is trustworthy, whether the institution is committed to the program, but they do not make an accreditation recommendation
Decision Process	The accreditation decision is made by the Unit Accreditation Board upon recommendation of the Board of Examiners. The UAB is composed of one-third teacher educators, one-third teachers, one-sixth state and local	The Accreditation Panel evaluates the Inquiry Brief. Consulting reviewers from the learned societies may evaluate sections of the Inquiry Brief. Seven panel members, appointed by President of TEAC for three-year

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Decision Process, <i>continued</i>	<p>policymakers, and one-sixth school specialists. In addition, one is from a student organization and one member is a public representative. All UAB members are nominated by constituent bodies. The UAB meets twice a year to review and vote on accreditation cases.</p> <p>Audit committees of the UAB read the institutional report, the BOE report, and the institutional rejoinder. Two audit committees meet jointly to prepare consensus recommendations for submission to the full UAB.</p> <p>The UAB may affirm, revise, or remove BOE citations of areas for improvement. The UAB may also change a BOE team's recommendation on met or not met standards.</p>	<p>terms, are drawn from following categories: teacher educators, higher education faculty and administrators, P-12 educators, public, education policymakers, education policy scholars, and TEAC auditors (ex-officio).</p> <p>The panel evaluates the Inquiry Brief and decides if the evidence is sufficient to certify that the program merits accreditation.</p> <p>The accreditation decision is made by the TEAC Board of Director's Accreditation Committee upon the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel.</p>
Appeals Process	<p>A five-member Review Panel is selected to hear the appeal of a decision made by another NCATE governing board. Members are appointed by NCATE's member associations. If the Appeals Board upholds the appeal, it is remanded to the UAB for consideration by a different audit committee.</p>	<p>A five-member Appeals Panel, appointed by the Chair of the TEAC Board of Directors, hears appeals. If the Appeals Panel upholds the appeal, it is sent to the TEAC board for administrative action.</p>
Accreditation Fees	<p>Annual sliding scale fee (\$1600 to \$3000) depending on size of unit. Institutions that are not affiliated with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education pay an additional annual Sustaining Fee. Visit fee of \$1000 per BOE member.</p>	<p>Flat annual dues of \$2000 and audit fee of \$1000 per Inquiry Brief (per program). The institution defrays expenses of auditors during visit.</p>
Categories of Accreditation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Candidate—pursuing initial accreditation after meeting preconditions. Awarded for five years. 2. Provisional (initial)—indicates that the unit has not met one or more of the standards. Unit must satisfy provisions by meeting previously unmet standards within six months or a focused visit on the unmet standards is conducted within two years. 2. Initial—indicates the unit meets each of the six NCATE standards. Awarded for term of five years. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Candidate—pursuing initial accreditation after having met the membership eligibility requirements. Awarded for five years. 2. Initial—awarded accreditation by TEAC for the first time. Awarded for term of five years. Programs that hold initial accreditation are required to submit a report each year that indicates that the evidence presented in the Inquiry Brief continues to support their pursuit of the TEAC's principles of quality. 3. Continuing—indicates that the program demonstrates on-going institutional inquiry. Awarded for

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Categories of Accreditation, <i>continued</i>	<p>In its subsequent annual reports, the unit will be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in NCATE's action report. Awarded for term of five years.</p> <p>3. Continuing—indicates that the unit meets each of the six NCATE standards. Awarded for term of seven years. In its subsequent annual reports, the unit describes progress made in addressing any areas for improvement.</p> <p>4. Accreditation with conditions—indicates that the unit has not met one or more of the NCATE standards. Unit must satisfy conditions by meeting previously unmet standards within two years.</p> <p>5. Accreditation with probation—indicates that the unit does not meet one or more of the NCATE standards, and has areas for improvement that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. Unit must schedule comprehensive (address all standards) on-site visit within two years.</p> <p>6. Denial—indicates that the unit does not meet one or more of the NCATE standards, and has areas for improvement that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.</p> <p>7. Revocation of accreditation—following a focused visit that occurs as a result of a provisional accreditation decision, revocation indicates that the unit has not sufficiently addressed the unmet standard(s).</p>	<p>term of ten years. Programs with continuing accreditation are required to provide an annual report updating previous evidence. A more substantive report is due in the seventh year portraying trends in evidence and introducing new evidence.</p> <p>4. Provisional—awarded to programs whose Brief meets most but not all of TEAC's Quality Principles. Program faculty must remedy the weaknesses in the Inquiry Brief within two years and become fully accredited.</p> <p>5. Pre-accreditation—awarded on a one-time basis to programs whose Brief is promising but inconclusive. Awarded for five years.</p> <p>6. New program accreditation—awarded to new or revised programs whose Inquiry Brief Proposal indicates initial accreditation is likely in the future. Awarded for five years.</p> <p>7. Denial—awarded to programs whose Brief does not meet TEAC standards or Quality Principles. Program reverts to candidate status.</p> <p>8. Adverse action—constitutes a revocation of accreditation status following a finding that the program is no longer in compliance with TEAC's principles, standards, and policies.</p>
Number of Accreditation Decisions in 2003	Initial: 6 Continuing: 54 Candidates: 34 Precandidates: 56	Initial: 2 Candidates: 59
Total Institutions Accredited	552	5
Members	Constituent (voting) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Association of Teacher Educators American Federation of Teachers 	Affiliate (non-voting) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> American Education Research Council Consortium for Excellence in Teacher Education

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

<p>Members, <i>continued</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. National Education Association 5. Council of Chief State School Officers 6. National Association of State Boards of Education 7. National School Boards Association 8. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages 9. American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance 10. International Reading Association 11. International Technology Education Association 12. National Council for the Social Studies 13. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics 14. National Science Teachers Association 15. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages 16. Association for Childhood Education International 17. Council for Exceptional Children 18. National Association for the Education of Young Children 19. National Middle School Association 20. Association for Education Communications and Technology 21. International Society for Technology in Education 22. American Educational Research Association 23. American Library Association 24. Council for Social Foundations of Education 25. National Association of School Psychologists 26. American Association of School Administrators 27. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 28. National Association of Black School Educators 29. National Association of Elementary School Principals 30. National Association of Secondary School Principals 31. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Council of Independent Colleges 4. Independent Colleges of Arkansas 5. Association of Private Colleges and Universities in Georgia 6. Kansas Independent College Association 7. Louisiana Association of Independent Colleges & Universities 8. Minnesota Private College Council 9. Mississippi Association of Independent Colleges 10. Commission of Independent Colleges and Universities of New York 11. North Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities 12. Oregon Independent Colleges Association 13. Independent Colleges and Universities of South Carolina 14. Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas 15. Vermont Association of Independent Colleges 16. Washington Association of Independent Colleges 17. West Virginia Association of Independent Colleges 18. Council for the Advancement of Private Colleges in Alabama
----------------------------------	--	--

COMPARISON OF NCATE AND TEAC PROCESSES FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Agency's Recognition	1. U. S. Department of Education (NACIQI) 2. Council for Higher Education Accreditation	1. U.S. Department of Education (NACIQI) 2. Council for Higher Education Accreditation
Year Founded	1954	1997
President	Arthur Wise	Frank Murray
Address	2010 Massachusetts Avenue NW Washington, DC 20036 (202) 466-7496 www.ncate.org	One Dupont Circle Suite 320 Washington, DC 20036 (202) 466-7236 www.teac.org

Sources: *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education*, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, DC, 2002

Guidelines for Preparation of an Inquiry Brief and an Inquiry Brief Proposal, Teacher Education Accreditation Council, Washington, DC, 2003

Prospectus for a New System of Teacher Education Accreditation, Teacher Education Accreditation Council, Washington, DC, 2003

Prepared by Joyce Huth Munro, Professional Issues Department
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1307 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005
October 2003
Updated December 2003

**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
ACCOUNTABILITY STATEMENT / MARCH 2003**

As the demand for more highly qualified teachers has risen, policy makers have responded by promoting a range of alternative routes to certification. Those who emerge from such routes are often held to different standards and exempted from the expectations and assessments set for others who follow more traditional preparation routes. As a result, the country is quickly building a dual system of teacher education. One is governed by rigorous professional standards, high admission criteria, extensive supervised clinical practice, and state and national review. The other often has a single test or standard for admission and proficiency, few requirements for program completion, minimal program review, truncated classroom experience, and insufficient supervision of candidates to assess teaching readiness.

AACTE demands that all candidates for teaching meet the same standards, as set by federal law. AACTE promotes the use of a common assessment to test all prospective teachers' knowledge of content and pedagogy. The efforts to subvert the law and create an alternative class of teachers must end.

The nation's teacher colleges and education schools prepared more than 200,000 teachers last year. More than 93% of these graduates passed state-administered teacher tests, and most took teaching positions in the nation's K-12 schools. Despite this success, professional preparation programs are the focus of criticism from policy and practitioner communities. Criticism of teacher education centers on its perceived inability to instruct teacher candidates in ways to produce greater K-12 student learning. The policy community is demanding that teacher colleges and education schools show the "value added" of their programs. AACTE is determined to respond to this expectation by showing that its members' graduates not only excel at today's teacher tests but are able to make a positive difference in the learning of their students. AACTE has mounted a campaign to ensure that all preparation programs gather evidence to show the impact of their graduates on K-12 student learning.

Today, more than 625 separate tests assess the capabilities of beginning teachers. Owned by at least three major test companies, they manifest the constraints of legal demands and workplace expectations for such occupational tests. Ways must be found to strengthen those assessments while recognizing that the ultimate test of beginning teachers' capacity to teach is their impact on the learning of every student in a K-12 classroom.

Therefore,
AACTE calls for the rigorous assessment of all prospective teachers' knowledge of both content and pedagogy regardless of the route pursued to become a teacher.

AACTE commits to facilitating the creation of a national evidentiary base to show the impact of teacher education on the learning of all K-12 students.

AACTE calls upon the National Research Council to work with a coalition of national organizations to design a common assessment and reporting system to assess candidate proficiency on the standards and expectations set by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium.

AACTE calls for a strengthening of the specialized accreditation process to stimulate greater attention to evidence-based accountability in all teacher preparation programs.

**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
1999**

Teacher Education Accountability and the Public Trust

The title of our organization, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, implies that we, as an association, have a dual accountability. A part of that accountability is, of course, to our member institutions. The other dimension of that accountability is to the public. AACTE's goal is to ensure coherence between these two dimensions of accountability for teacher education.

Teaching is, above all, a moral act.¹ Teachers and because of our role in the preparation of educators, teacher educators are in a position of influence and exercise a form of stewardship for educational values and standards. AACTE, as the professional organization most directly responsible for teacher education, must be accountable to the public to prepare educators who in turn do not violate that public trust.

Legal authority for the professional preparation of educators is vested in each individual state. Institutions of higher education, teacher education programs, and states find themselves facing the same dilemma: constraints on resources coupled with increasing demands for public accountability. A goal shared by states, institutions, and teacher educators is the desire to answer accountability demands in a responsible manner, without defining the preparation of educators in such a narrow context that accountability appears at odds with major values of the education profession. Recent history provides reminders that educational accountability may sometimes be conceived within an ideology predicated upon production and political expediency, resulting in an orientation toward conformity, passivity, and diminished creativity. The resolution of this dilemma is to focus the concept of accountability on basic values and high standards that educators share for the teaching of all students.

High Standards for Teacher Education Accountability

Our basic values and high standards lead us, as teacher educators, to hold ourselves to:

- , Serve first and foremost as an advocate for P-12 students, especially for promoting the growth and development of **all** students;
- , Promote diversity in teacher education faculty, candidates, curriculum, and programs;

¹Sockett, H. (1990). Accountability, trust, and ethical codes of practice. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, and K. A. Sirotnik (eds.), *The Moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- , Be accountable to the education public: parents, other citizens, and state agencies directly responsible for teacher licensure and program approval;
- , Be accountable to prospective teachers for their preparation to meet state licensure expectations (including knowledge of subject matter and of the students to whom those subjects are taught);
- , Involve in governance those who have been appropriately prepared and/or licensed for professional practice;
- , Be informed by the best practice and most current research on teaching and learning theory and practice, including the commitment to active scholarship by teacher education faculty; and
- , Operate in collaboration with professional agencies responsible for quality assurance in the teaching profession.

Consequently, we hold any teacher education quality assurance bodies (including licensure, accreditation, and certification) to these same principles.

Collaborative Accountability

In recent years, states have undertaken major reforms in teacher licensure that reflect the seriousness of their commitment to accountability for teacher preparation. Through INTASC and related efforts, states have taken steps to link teacher licensure to P-12 standards; to license teachers through performance assessments rather than indirect or proxy measures; to center the licensure process directly on individual teacher performance rather than indirectly on approval of programs; and to establish periodic re-assessment of teachers linked to emerging frameworks for relicensure. These movements toward a fully licensed teaching profession have powerful implications for the preparation of teachers in institutions of higher education.

AACTE recognizes other essential support for accountability provided by initiatives such as the teacher certification system being developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and its efforts toward a comprehensive continuum of quality assurance for teacher education. AACTE also applauds initiatives for improving teacher education undertaken by IHE presidents through collaboratives such as The Renaissance Group and initiatives such as Project 30 that involve liberal arts faculty. These integrated efforts toward professional and institutional accountability represent a recognition of responsibility to the broader P-16 educational continuum.

AACTE's efforts to ensure coherence between accountability to the profession and the public function in tandem with our responsibilities to higher education institutions in which teacher preparation is housed. Professional education programs, and AACTE by extension, have numerous forms of internal accountability to support institutional mission, academic standards, and resources. Effective and professionally responsible teacher preparation programs contribute significantly to the leadership role that presidents and higher education institutions can play in P-16 improvement and reform. Can agenda of ultimate benefit to the institution itself.

AACTE needs to move forward toward a shared responsibility with other groups in the profession on behalf of P-16 education, and to build mutual accountability around the students we serve. To that end, we believe that the principal means of quality assurance and accountability is the partnership of professional organizations in developing standards and conducting standards-based review of teacher preparation institutions. AACTE strongly endorses national professional accreditation as a major tool for achieving high standards that supports the learning of all students and that provides a high level of accountability to the public trust we hold.

Approved by AACTE Executive Committee, April 1997
Re-approved by AACTE Executive Committee, July 1999